

REMARKS

1. Allowed Claims

Applicants graciously acknowledge that the Examiner allowed claims 14-20 in the Office Action mailed May 8, 2006. Applicants also graciously acknowledge that the Examiner stated that claims 4, 6, 8, and 10-13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 7 are amended. No new matter is introduced in this amendment.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabin (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,464) in view of Ornato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,457,312) and Segawa et al. (Pub. No. 2004/0019879). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segawa et al., Rabin, and Ornato et al., and further in view of Sekura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,383). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segawa et al., Rabin, and Ornato et al., and further in view of Albaum et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,095). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

A. Claims 1-6

Independent claim 1 as amended recites “determining a localized printed time of said data by localizing said data on the time scaled area chart.” Claim 1 as amended also recites “in order to detect a possible inconsistency between the location of said data on the time scaled area chart and the time that said data was filled in.” On page 3 of the Office Action, the rejection acknowledges that Rabin and Ornato et al. do not disclose comparing the recording time with the

localized printed time of the data, so as to detect any inconsistency between the recording time and the printed time.

Segawa et al. cannot overcome this deficiency. Segawa et al. relates to a method for controlling electronic write request from a plurality of separate terminals to prevent conflicting amendments to the same document. *See, e.g.,* Abstract; Para. 0076. Hence, Segawa et al. is not relevant to the present invention as it does not relate to processing information that is hand-written on a printed observation form.

Furthermore, the portion of Segawa et al. cited by the Office Action discloses a comparison between a recorded time and a last write time in a monitor field. However, Segawa et al. does not disclose determining the localized printed time of data by localizing the data on a time scaled area chart. Segawa et al. also does not disclose detecting an inconsistency between the location of data on a time scaled area chart and the time that that data was filled in. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Rabin, Ornato et al., and Segawa et al. Additionally, claims 2-6 depend upon claim 1 and should be allowable for similar reasons.

B. Claims 7-13

Independent claim 7 as amended recites “means for determining a localized printed time of said data by localizing said data on the time scaled area chart.” Claim 7 as amended also recites “in order to detect a possible inconsistency between the location of said data on the time scaled area chart and the time that said data was filled in.” On page 4 of the Office Action, the rejection acknowledges that Rabin and Ornato et al. do not disclose comparing the recording time

Application No. 10/632,588
Amendment Dated July 7, 2006
Response to Office Action Mailed May 8, 2006


with the localized printed time of the data, so as to detect any inconsistency between the recording time and the printed time.

Furthermore, as indicated previously, the portion of Segawa et al. cited by the Office Action does not disclose determining the localized printed time of data by localizing the data on a time scaled area chart nor detecting an inconsistency between the location of data on a time scaled area chart and the time that that data was filled in. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is allowable over the combination of Rabin, Ornato et al., and Segawa et al. Additionally, claims 8-13 depend upon claim 7 and should be allowable for similar reasons.

SUMMARY

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4277.

Respectfully submitted,


Timothy J. Le Duc
Registration No. 54,745
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: July 7, 2006

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200